Efficacy of face coverings in reducing transmission of COVID-19: calculations based on models of droplet capture
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In the COVID–19 pandemic, among the more controversial issues is the use of masks and face coverings. Much of the concern boils down to the question – just how effective are face coverings? One means to address this question is to review our understanding of the physical mechanisms by which masks and coverings operate – steric interception, inertial impaction, diffusion and electrostatic capture. We enquire as to what extent these can be used to predict the efficacy of coverings. We combine the predictions of the models of these mechanisms which exist in the filtration literature and compare the predictions with recent experiments and lattice Boltzmann simulations, and find reasonable agreement with the former and good agreement with the latter. We build on these results to predict the utility of various materials from which masks are comprised, and predict their efficiency for removing particles of varying size. We make assumptions about the relative viral load of the respirable droplet size distribution to show that even simple cloth-based face coverings have the potential to significantly reduce the number of secondary infections per infected individual.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is emerging in the response to the COVID–19 pandemic that a key uncertainty in reducing transmission is the use – or otherwise – of face coverings [1–4]. While we emphasise that correlation does not imply causality, we note that those countries in which the use of face coverings has become cultural (e.g. Japan, China, South Korea), partly in response to the SARS and swine flu outbreaks [6,7], the rate of transmission is low. At the time of writing, 133 countries have mandated the use of face coverings (or already practiced universal masking) in public spaces such as on public transport, 18 countries mandate coverings on a regional level and a further 14 countries recommend (but do not require) the public wear coverings [6]. The World Health Organisation advises wear coverings [6], and now advise that the public wear them and offer some guidance on the essential features of effective coverings [7].

Respiratory diseases may be transmitted by direct contact, inhalation of infective droplets, or droplets may be deposited nearby as fomites allowing infection to pass through contact with the contaminated environment [4,5,10]. It is believed that direct inhalation (or inspiration) are the main routes for transmission of SARS-CoV-2, with particular emphasis placed on the larger droplets [2,4,11]. However, there is growing evidence that small respirable aerosol particles play a role in transmission [3, 4, 6–10, 12–18], and face coverings could reduce transmission through this route. It is important to distinguish the two motivations for the use of face coverings: on the one hand to protect the wearer i.e. as personal protective equipment (PPE), and on the other to suppress onward transmission of the virus i.e. as source control. The evidence suggests that the majority of cases of transmission occur from asymptomatic or presymptomatic patients [4,10,19–27]. Depending on their efficacy, adopting widespread use of face coverings could substantially reduce the rate of transmission per individual.

While the use of face coverings is not without its own risks [1,2,4,28], it has received considerable criticism in comparison to other non-pharmaceutical interventions such as increased handwashing [29]. In any case, a crucial part of making an informed decision about the use of face coverings is to know – just how effective are they? The literature on face coverings is limited [2,28], and there is a great deal of inconsistency and a lack of clarity in the guidance concerning their use. We believe that this stems in part from the academic literature on the subject, which is a combination of medical studies (using either live wearers [30,32] or mannequins [33,35]), retrospective studies [2,9,17,36,37], epidemiological modelling [2,35,39] engineering studies (particularly in the filtration literature) [34,35,37,45] and aerosol science [2,9,11,13–16,18,19]. Such a complex phenomenon as transmission via airborne droplets of course depends on very many parameters (e.g. air flow, humidity, separation, mask fit). The disparate disciplines which have considered the use of face coverings take wildly differing approaches, and there seems to be a lack of any consistent experimental protocol, and studies typically only address a subset of
the parameters upon which transmission depends.

So limited is our knowledge that the Royal Society’s DELVE report [2] observed that “to our knowledge only two studies have been performed that studied the effectiveness of mask use by the source patient with a viral respiratory infection (mostly influenza) and tracking the development of viral infection symptoms in others. Both studies have flaws, the most serious of which were sample sizes that were too low or an unexpectedly mild respiratory virus season.” This uncertainty aside, it is nevertheless clear that there is a very significant airborne component to transmission [1, 38–40, 47]. The reproduction number $R_0$, the number of secondary infections that arise from an infected individual, is reasonably approximated as being proportional to $\beta$ [38]. We wish to estimate to what extent mask interventions reduce $\beta$ from an initial value of $\beta_0$ in the absence of masking. Incorporating face coverings into such models leads to the reduced rate of disease transmission [38]

$$\beta = \beta_0(1 - e_{pm})(1 - e_{ex}p_m)$$

(1)

where $p_m$ is the adherence to mask wearing (i.e. the probability that an individual wears a covering), $e_{(in,ex)}$ are the effectiveness of interventions on inhalation and exhalation. While unrealistic, the symmetrical case $e_{in} = e_{ex}$ allows us to follow Howard et al. [1] and Tian et al. [38] to illustrate the potential impact of mask use in Fig. 1 [1, 35].

Here, we seek to determine and to assess, to what extent the different types of coverings are effective. We also wish to explore whether efficacy can be made predictive in any meaningful way, given the nature of the material from which a given face covering is comprised. To this end, we critically assess the literature of models, which describe droplet capture in filters and compare these with experimental and simulation data where appropriate. With the routes of infection not yet established it is important to clarify the efficacy of face coverings across a range of droplet sizes. We use droplet to refer to liquid particles of any size, independent of the mechanisms by which they transmit pathogens [38].

The mechanisms by which droplets are captured by filters are reasonably well-established [49]. There are four principle mechanisms by which droplets may be captured by fibres in a covering which concern us here [42].

- **Steric interception** – capture neglecting inertia, so a droplet follows stream lines of the air but collides with a fibre due to the size of the droplet.
- **Inertial impaction** – where inertia is taken into account resulting in the droplet deviating from stream lines and colliding with the fibre.
- **Diffusion** – diffusion of droplets in the air leads to contact with a fibre.
- **Electrostatic capture** – Coulombic and/or dipolar attractions between the droplets and fibres pull the droplet into contact. Note that the previous three mechanisms assume no interaction until particle/fibre contact. Studying this mechanism requires knowledge of the charge distribution in the droplets and fibres.

Gravitation can also play a role in droplet capture, however this is negligible compared to the other mechanisms outlined above [50]. Here, we explore the above four mechanisms, under reasonable assumptions for the parameters that characterise the material from which face coverings are comprised (e.g. fibre dimensions, number of fibres per unit volume) and the environmental conditions (e.g. humidity, rate of airflow).

Here we shall primarily focus on those filtration mechanisms pertinent to droplet capture in cloth masks: interception and inertial impaction. We review the literature which addresses these mechanisms and assess experimental measurements of droplet capture by face coverings. We then investigate properties of certain face covering materials and predict the effectiveness of each using the theory and our own measurements. We conclude that for many cloth masks capture of droplets larger than $\gtrsim 5\, \mu m$ is highly effective, which is not unexpected. For smaller ($0.1$ to $10\, \mu m$) droplets, the efficacy is dependent on the type of material from which the face covering is comprised, and the size distribution of the fibres is a significant point.

This paper is organised as follows: in section II we describe experiments exploring the material properties
of fabrics. Section \[III\] is dedicated to theory and simulations for filtration by a single-fibre. Then in section \[IV\] we investigate the filtration properties of fabrics by combining the work of previous sections. In section \[V\] we estimate how effective face coverings are at filtering out exhaled droplets, in order to predict the reduction in disease transmission rates. We discuss the significance of our findings in section \[VI\] and conclude in section \[VII\].

The code used to do the calculations in this work is available at Ref. [51].

II. MATERIAL PROPERTIES OF MASKS

Fabrics are broadly categorised as knitted, woven or non-woven. We refer to face coverings that would be worn by members of the public, that are neither surgical masks nor respirators, as cloth masks, and we use masks as a catch-all term for all kinds of filters. Filtration theory is well-developed for non-woven materials [42], which are typical of surgical masks and respirators. However, cloth masks typically contain knitted or woven fabrics so we introduce some fundamental characteristics of these fabrics below.

Knitted and woven fabrics are created by spinning fibres into yarn [52]. In practice many of these threads are typically twisted together (the “ply”) into a composite yarn with additional stability against being unwound. Note that the process described above is for staple yarn, where the natural fibres are short, but a different process (filament yarn) may be used where the fibres are naturally long (e.g. silk or synthetic polymers) which results in smoother thread (cf. silk strands are smooth in Fig. 2(a)) whereas cotton thread in Fig. 2(b) features stray strands resembling a frayed rope).

Weaving involves interlacing multiple parallel yarn into a tight pattern, whereas knit fabrics are formed by drawing the yarn in complex loops (the “stitches”). Knitting thus results in regions of high curvature, so threads are able to bend which typically results in stretchier fabrics. By contrast, non-woven materials are formed by entangling the fibres mechanically, thermally or chemically which results in a less ordered structure.

The filtration characteristics of masks depends on many parameters, including the size and charge on the droplets as well as mask properties such as fibre thickness, density of fibres, their material composition and thickness of the mask. In addition, in cloth fabrics details of yarn structure and weave/knit pattern matter. Treating all of these within a single framework represents a significant challenge, so we focus on the most relevant parameters.

A. Contact forces

All combinations of fibres and droplets interact on contact between the droplet and the fibre, even when they are electrically neutral. In almost all cases we expect droplets to stick when they contact the surface of the fibre. Whether a droplet sticks and spreads on a surface it contacts, or carries on moving, is controlled by the ratios of two competing energies. The first energy acts to keep droplets moving without sticking: the inertial or kinetic energy. The second energy drives sticking and spreading of the droplets: the surface free energy.

For droplets in the size range of interest the surface free energy is much larger than the kinetic energy, so the surface free energy will win, and the droplet will stick — at least in the vast majority of cases. The ratio of the kinetic energy to the surface free energy is the Weber number:

\[ \text{We} = \frac{\text{kinetic energy}}{\text{surface free energy}} = \frac{\rho_p d_p U_0^2}{\gamma}, \]

for a droplet of mass density \(\rho_p\), diameter \(d_p\), surface tension \(\gamma\), and moving at speed \(U_0\).

For mucus droplets, \(\gamma \approx 0.05 \text{N m}^{-1}\) [53]. For a droplet of diameter \(d_p \sim 10 \mu\text{m}\) travelling at \(0.1 \text{m s}^{-1}\), we expect them to dominate and the vast majority of droplets to stick on contact. Natural fibres such as cotton are more hydrophilic than synthetic polymers used in medical-grade surgical masks and respirators. However, at these very small Weber numbers we do not expect this variation to have a significant effect. Small droplets can even stick to hydrophobic surfaces [54].

B. Experiments

We examined a variety of fabrics used to make masks including cloth masks, surgical masks and respirators. These masks are typically multi-layered structures, and were decomposed into their individual layers for examination. Their properties are summarised in Fig. 2(d) and a full breakdown is given in Table [II] in the Supplementary Information (SI). An important quantity for filtration is the volume fraction of fibres \(\alpha\). To obtain the volume fractions of the fabrics, squares of area 1, 2.25 and 4 cm\(^2\) were weighed three times and their thickness was measured through images obtained using bright-field microscopy (Leica DMI 3000B) with a 4x and 10x objective, depending on the thickness of the fabric. The volume fraction was then obtained from the ratio of the measured density to known values of the bulk material density. The material composition of the surgical masks and respirators were not stated by the manufacturer, so we assumed they were made from polypropylene fibres. We neglect any porosity within the fibre; the SEM images in Fig. 2(a-c) and the SI suggests that the porosity is not large enough to significantly affect the measured volume fractions.

We found that the majority of fabric layers were 0.4 to 1.2 mm thick consistent with e.g. Ref. [55] and had
volume fractions in the range $0.05 \leq \alpha \leq 0.15$; these ranges are circled in Fig. 2(d). A notable exception to the latter rule included a silk tie with $\alpha \sim 0.26$; however we found this sample to be difficult to breathe through when placed to the face, making it unsuitable as a potential mask material.

For scanning electron microscopy (SEM) characterisation, samples were mounted on SEM stubs and coated with gold/palladium in an Emitech K575X Sputter coater before being imaged in an FEI Quanta 200 FEGSEM (Thermo Fisher Scientific). SEM images were taken at 8 kV using comparable magnifications for all the fabrics. From these images we manually measured the distribution of fibre diameters $d_f$, using the open-source software Fiji [56], and parameterised it with a log-normal fit. A minimum of 50 individual fibres were measured per fabric. The size distributions obtained for cotton samples in Fig. 2(e), and the remaining distributions are given in the SI. For cotton we find $\ln(d_f/\mu\text{m}) \sim N(\mu = 2.68, \sigma^2 = 0.12)$, so a cotton layer $\sim 1\text{ mm}$ thick will typically be 50 to 100 fibres thick.

III. CAPTURE OF DROPLETS BY A SINGLE FIBRE

In this and the next section we describe the standard theory for filtration of droplets/particles, test its assumptions and generalise it to incorporate the polydisperse fibre size distributions obtained in the previous section. In this section, we explore how a single fibre can collect droplets, and in the next section we look at filtration by a fabric formed from a mesh of such fibres. We mostly follow Ref. [42], but we also make use of Refs. [46, 50]. We use the subscript $f$ for fibre and $p$ for incident particles, e.g. $d_p$ is the particle diameter whereas $d_f$ is the fibre diameter.
A. Single-fibre efficiency from idealised flows

To understand the filtering capacity of a single fibre, we consider the flow around an infinitely long cylinder aligned perpendicular to the direction of flow. Assuming that the particles faithfully follow the streamlines infinitely far from the cylinder, we define the single-fibre efficiency as the fraction of particles collected by the fibre, i.e.

\[ \eta = \frac{\text{number of collection trajectories}}{\text{number of streamlines}}. \]  

(2)

Infinitely far from the mask the velocity field is \( \mathbf{u} = U_0 \mathbf{e}_z \) so that the streamlines are distributed uniformly on planes with normal vector \( \mathbf{e}_z \), as in Fig. 3(a). We assumed \( z \)-symmetry so that our problem geometry is two-dimensional in the \( xy \)-plane, so this leaves width (in the \( y \)-direction) as a suitable measure for the number of streamlines. Given these considerations we can write the single-fibre efficiency as \( \eta = \lambda / L_y \) where \( \lambda \) is the width of the collection window in Fig. 3 and \( L_y \) is the total width of the mask in the \( y \)-direction.

Our definition of single-fibre efficiency differs from that normally used in filtration literature, namely the quantity \( \lambda / d_f \) in e.g. Refs. [12][46][60]. We have chosen a definition which guarantees \( \eta \leq 1 \) so it can be interpreted as a probability; the more common definition is not properly normalised which can lead to incorrect and poorly posed results when combining multiple collection mechanisms (cf. section III A 5).

1. Kuwabara flow field

Flow through a filter occurs at low Reynolds number, so it is well described by Stokes flow. There is no solution to Stokes flow around a free cylinder because of the Stokes paradox [57], however the mask is composed of many fibres and we can obtain a solution for flow around a fibre immersed in an effective neighbourhood of other fibres: the Kuwabara flow [58]. The effective neighbourhood is treated as an outer circle boundary at distance \( a_f / \sqrt{\alpha} \) where \( a_f \) is the radius of the fibre, so that the flow is modelled in the coaxial region \( a_f / \sqrt{\alpha} \leq \rho \leq a_f / \sqrt{\alpha} \) which allows solution without a paradox. Moreover, the radial component of the velocity at the outer boundary is taken as \( u_r(\rho = a_f / \sqrt{\alpha}) = U_0 \cos \theta \). \( U_0 \) is the average flow speed through the mask, obtained by dividing the flow speed at the mask surface (cf. table 1) by \( 1 - \alpha \) to account for the compression of the flow through the mask pores.

For incompressible flow \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 \) the velocity field can be expressed in terms of a streamfunction, i.e.

\[ \mathbf{u} = \nabla \times \psi \]  

(3)

where

\[ \psi(\rho, \theta) = U_0 f(\rho) \sin \theta \mathbf{e}_z, \]  

(4a)

\[ f(\rho) = f_1 + f_2 \rho + f_3 \rho^3 + f_4 \rho \ln \left( \frac{\rho}{a_f} \right), \]  

(4b)

with coefficients \( \{ f_i \} \) set by the boundary conditions. The Kuwabara flow field is obtained by assuming the velocity vanishes on the fibre surface \( u(\rho = a_f) = 0 \), and that the vorticity \( \nabla \times \mathbf{u} \) vanishes at the outer boundary \( \rho = a_f / \sqrt{\alpha} \) to approximate the neighbourhood around the fibre [58]. We give the explicit values of the coefficients obtained in the SI.

2. Lattice Boltzmann flow field

To test the validity of the Kuwabara flow field, we also calculated flow fields using Lattice Boltzmann (LB) simulations [59][62]. In these simulations the Reynolds number \( Re \) is nonzero, and can be varied, and the fluid is compressible. However, at our small \( Re \) the spatial variation in density is very small. To do the LB simulations we use a modified version of a code from PALABOS group at the University of Geneva [63]. See SI for details.

We have performed two types of LB simulations. In the first we can calculate the flow field around a single fibre, which allows us to calculate the single-fibre collection window \( \lambda \). In the second we calculate the flow field in a disordered hexagonal lattice of fibres, which is our model of a mask. This flow field allows us to test the theory’s ability to predict filtration efficiency, at least within our simple two-dimensional model. In all cases we run the LB simulations until we reach steady state, and then use the steady-state flow field.
4. Particle deposition and collection efficiency

For the LB flow field the length of the single-fibre collection window $\lambda$ can be determined by direct measurement of its geometric definition in Fig. 3. The Kuwabara flow field is only valid in the region of high curvature close to the fibre surface, so determining $\lambda$ is slightly more subtle.

Defining $n$ as the number density of incoming particles, the continuity equation in the steady-state $\dot{n} = 0$ yields

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{flow speeds at mask surface} \\
\text{effective mask area} & \quad 190 \text{cm}^2 \quad [68] \\
\text{flow speed (moderate)} & \quad 2.7 \text{ cm s}^{-1} \\
\text{flow speed (maximal)} & \quad 7.5 \text{ cm s}^{-1} 
\end{align*}
\]

TABLE I. Table of key parameter values for masks including air, water and mucus at 20 °C and atmospheric pressure 10^5 Pa. Note that small droplets dry rapidly and this will cause their viscosity to increase. Flow rates are determined from the volume typically exhaled during one minute. Moderate exertion is defined as that readily able to be sustained daily during 8 hours of work, whereas maximal exertion is the upper limit of what can be sustained for short periods of time (e.g. during competitive sports). Flow speeds are calculated for the stated mask area and flow rates assuming perfect face seal; in practice leakage would reduce flow through the mask.
\[ \nabla \cdot (n \mathbf{v}) = 0. \]  
All particle trajectories that terminate on the fibre surface are contained in the volume bounded by the limiting path shown by a solid black line in Fig. 4(a). We integrate the continuity equation over this and apply the divergence theorem to give

\[ \int_{S_0} n \mathbf{v} \cdot d\mathbf{S} + \int_{S_1} n \mathbf{v} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = 0 \]  
(8)

using the fact that the \( \mathbf{v} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = 0 \) along the limiting trajectory and the fibre surface at \( r = a_f \), and the surfaces \( S_{(0,1)} \) are defined in Fig. 4(a). We write the magnitude of either integral in the above expression as \( \Phi/2 \): (half) the rate of particle deposition on the fibre surface. We multiply by two to account for collection along both sides of the fibre, taking advantage of the symmetry in the \( y \)-direction.

The width of the collection window is determined from the deposition rate by \( \lambda = \Phi/n_0 U_0 L_z \) where \( n_0 \) is the particle number density far away from the fibre and \( U_0 \) is the flow speed. We apply the boundary condition \( n_0(r = a_f/\sqrt{\alpha}) \), which is a constant along \( S_0 \) so we have an expression for collection efficiency as

\[ \lambda = \frac{d_f}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \int_\alpha^R \tilde{v}_\rho \left( \theta; \rho = \frac{a_f}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) d\theta. \]  
(9)

The velocity field at the outer boundary is a boundary condition of the field, so \( \theta_0 \) is the key quantity needed to evaluate efficiency through this route. For \( \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u} \) at the boundary this reduces to

\[ \lambda = d_f \sin(\theta_0) f \left( \frac{a_f}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right). \]

The angle \( \theta_0 \) is obtained by following the limiting trajectory (e.g. the one shown in Fig. 4(a)) that only just glances the fibre. Particle trajectories are defined by

\[ \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{d\rho}{d\theta} = \frac{v_\rho}{v_0}, \]  
(10)

which can be integrated backwards in time with final conditions \( r = a_f \) and \( \theta = \theta_1 \) to determine \( \theta_0 \).

5. Single-fibre efficiency from combined mechanisms

From the definition of the single-fibre collection efficiency \( \eta \), we can see that if the mechanisms act completely independently then the penetration probability, the probability of passing the fibre, will be the product of the penetration probabilities due to the individual mechanisms i.e.

\[ 1 - \eta = \prod_k \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda_k}{L_y} \right) = 1 - \sum_k \frac{\lambda_k}{L_y} + \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{(\lambda_k/L_y)^2}{} \right) \]

where \( k \) sums over the different mechanisms and the last step is valid in the macroscopic limit \( (\lambda/L_y)^2 \ll 1 \). However, in practice these mechanisms are not independent and the relative catchment lengths \( \lambda_k \) will overlap. Assuming perfect overlap and no interaction between mechanisms, the total efficiency will simply equal the most efficient individual mechanism i.e. \( \max \{ \eta_k \} \).

Combining the two limits above, we find

\[ \frac{\max \{ \lambda_k \}}{L_y} \leq \eta \leq \sum_k \frac{\lambda_k}{L_y} \]

If one mechanism dominates over the others then these two bounds converge and we can simply take the dominant mechanism. As noted in the introduction, there are four principle mechanisms by which droplets may be captured by a mask which concern us here, steric interception, inertial impaction, diffusion and electrostatic capture \([42]\).

Electrostatic capture is crucial for high efficiency filtration of particles with size of order \( \mathcal{O}(0.1 \mu m) \) in res-
The fibre diameter \( d_f \) in the relevant size regime and warrants a more detailed treatment. We use standard results for diffusion (and electrostatics for respirators), given in the SI.

To determine the single-fibre collection window \( \lambda \) for finite Stokes number \( St \), we use an iterative scheme where we test whether a particular initial angle leads to collision with the fibre, and update a lower and upper bound for \( \theta_0 \) accordingly. By testing for collision for the midpoint between the current bounds, we ensure each iteration adds \( \sim 1 \) bit of information to the approximation of \( \lambda \) and convergence is rapid. For the LB flow field we use a similar scheme, but varying the initial height of the particle far from the mask where the flow is parallel (cf. Fig. 3).

**B. Droplet inertia rapidly increases efficiency above a threshold value**

Inertia causes droplets to deviate from streamlines which can bring particles closer to the fibre enhancing capture. The inertia, as measured by the Stokes’ number \( St \), increases as \( d_f^2 \) so this mode dominates capture of large droplets. Naively, we would expect this increase in efficiency to be a simple increasing function of the Stokes number. However, inertia also carries particles closer to the fibre where the flow is slower and more curved, which increases the opposing forces acting against the particle; this creates competition and inertial capture is non-trivial for intermediate values of \( St \).

**FIG. 6.** (colour online) Comparison of theoretical model against Lattice Boltzmann simulations. (a) Plot of the single fibre \( \lambda \) as a function of particle diameter calculated from the Kuwabara (solid lines) and LB (dashed lines)/flow fields. (b) Comparison between the penetration \( P \) calculated using LB simulations of model filters (points) with the predictions of Kuwabara (solid lines) and LB (dashed lines) flow fields. (a) Plot of the single fibre \( \lambda \) as a function of particle diameter calculated from the Kuwabara (solid lines) and LB (dashed lines)/flow fields. (b) Comparison between the penetration \( P \) calculated using LB simulations of model filters (points) with the predictions of Kuwabara (solid lines) and LB (dashed lines) flow fields.

For interception, collection occurs when the finite-sized particles touch the surface of the fibre while passing, with the limiting trajectory occurring at \( \theta_1 = \pi/2 \). The particle follows the flow \( v = u \) (inertia is included in impaction but not in interception) and the limiting trajectory occurs at \( \theta_1 = \pi/2 \), so \( \theta_R = 2\pi (a_f + a_p, \pi/2)/U_0 \). In general, capture efficiency is further enhanced by diffusion and inertia. The role of diffusion is quantified by the Péclet number,

\[
Pe = \frac{\text{rate of convection}}{\text{rate of diffusion}} = \frac{d_f U_0}{D},
\]

where \( D \) is the particle diffusion coefficient for motion relative to the flow. We find that \( Pe \ll 1 \) for \( d_f \gtrsim 1 \mu m \) so diffusion is negligible for capture of larger droplets. Similarly, inertia plays no role in the capture of smaller droplets \( d_f \lesssim 0.1 \mu m \) because \( St \ll 1 \) in that regime. Most exhaled droplets are larger \( d_f \gtrsim 1 \mu m \), thus inertia is crucial to the effectiveness of cloth masks in the relevant size regime and warrants a more detailed analysis.
of these fibres, and calculate filtration efficiencies from $\lambda$, the volume fraction $\alpha$ and thickness of the filter.

For simplicity we consider a rectangular filter of dimensions $(L_x, L_y, L_z)$, although the shape details perpendicular to the direction of flow do not matter because we will ultimately consider the limit of an infinite plane. On average the streamlines (carrying particles) will occupy an effective area of $(1 - \alpha)A$, so the effective efficiency is modified to $\eta_k = \lambda_k/(1 - \alpha)L_y$, where we have introduced a subscript $k$ for the efficiency of fibre $k$ as materials are generally heterogeneous and $\lambda$ will be taken from a distribution of values (cf. distribution of fibre sizes in Fig. 2(e)). Assuming the results for single fibres of previous sections, the probability that a particle is collected by fibre $k$ then equals the probability that a cylinder of diameter $\lambda_k$ crosses the particle path. Those results assume that all the fibres are aligned perpendicular to the flow direction.

In the simplest case where the particle trajectory is a straight line through the filter, the probability that a particle passes the $k^\text{th}$ fibre is $P_k^{(1)} = 1 - \eta_k$. Assuming the fibres act independently gives the penetration, the

### FIG. 7. (colour online) Model prediction for cloth masks. (a) Efficiency of mask collection at a flow rate of $Q = 901\text{ min}^{-1}$. We show the expected upper and lower ranges of efficiencies for the range of material properties shown in Fig. 2 (dotted lines), and the result for a 1 mm cotton layer with $\alpha = 0.1$ (solid line). Points/dashed lines: experimental data points from Ref. [44]. (b) Effect of increasing number of layers on collection efficiency in cotton, taking $\alpha$ from Ref. [44]. (b) Distribution of droplet sizes at exhalation [72, 75] weighted by moment $d_p^m$; $m = 0$ thus gives the number distribution whereas $m = 3$ gives a volume-weighted distribution.

### FIG. 8. (colour online) Properties of exhaled droplets. (a) Time for droplets containing non-volatile components to sediment under different relative humidities (RH) reproducing data from Ref. [19]. For RH = 100% the droplets absorb moisture from the air. (b) Distribution of droplet sizes at exhalation [72, 75] weighted by moment $d_p^m$; $m = 0$ thus gives the number distribution whereas $m = 3$ gives a volume-weighted distribution.

---

increases rapidly. To see this, consider a fibre of diameter 15 µm (typical of cotton from Fig. 2(e)), in air for a flow speed of 2.7 cm s$^{-1}$ corresponding to breathing during moderate exertion. LB calculations for a particle of diameter 2 µm find a collection range $\lambda = 0.36$ µm or about 2.5% of the fibre width. However, increasing the particle diameter to 8 µm yields a collection range $\lambda = 7.1$ µm or almost half the fibre width.

### IV. FROM SINGLE FIBRES TO TOTAL FILTER EFFICIENCY

In the previous section we developed the theory for the width of the region over which a single fibre collects the droplets: $\lambda$. In this section we model a filter as an array
total fraction of particles that pass through the filter, as
\[
P = \lim_{L_y \to \infty} \prod_{k=1}^{N} P_k^{(1)}
\]
where \(N = n L_z L_y\) is the total number of fibres in terms of fibre density \(n = 4 \alpha / \pi d_f^2\). Geometrically, the \(L_y \to \infty\) limit above takes the limiting geometry as an infinite plate (as \(L_z \to \infty\) is already implicit in our 2d formulation). We take this limit by considering the logarithm of both sides, giving
\[
\ln P = \lim_{L_y \to \infty} n L_z L_y \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \ln \mu(d_f) \, d\mu(d_f)
\]
which introduces the measure on the fibre size distribution \(\mu(d_f)\) that is normalised through \(\int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \mu(d_f) = 1\). Taking the limit yields
\[
\lim_{L_y \to \infty} L_y \ln \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{(1 - \alpha) L_y}\right) = -\frac{\lambda}{1 - \alpha},
\]
so the total penetration becomes
\[
P = \exp \left(-\frac{L_y}{\xi}\right), \quad (11a)
\]
with penetration length
\[
\xi = \frac{(1 - \alpha) \pi}{4 \alpha \lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} d_f^2 \, \mu(d_f), \quad (11b)
\]
and effective collection window
\[
\bar{\lambda} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \lambda(d_f) \, d\mu(d_f). \quad (11c)
\]

Finally, we take the measure to be a log-normal distribution based on the fits to the experimental measurements described in section [11B] (cf. table [11] in SI).

Our fundamental assumptions to achieve the above expressions were that (a) the fibres act independently, and (b) their sizes are independent and identically distributed random variables.

We compare the mask collection efficiency \(1 - P\), against the experimental data of [Konda et al.] [44] in Fig. 7(a). The theory is broadly in agreement with the experimental data for a range of fabrics, in particular it captures the sharp rise in collection efficiencies in the \(\mathcal{O}(1\mu m)\) range. The filtration theory we have employed makes rudimentary geometric assumptions, including that the filter is entirely two-dimensional, yet this appears sufficient to capture the behaviour. The details of the three-dimensional structure, including the thread and the knit or woven pattern, appear thus less important than the size distribution of the natural fibres. While inertia is the dominant mechanism for the transition to perfect capture of larger particles, we found that diffusion (which we model using standard relations given in the SI) enhances capture in the \(\mathcal{O}(0.1\mu m)\) range (and smaller sizes still, though particles with \(d_f \lesssim 0.1\mu m\) would be smaller than SARS-CoV-2 viruses so they are unimportant in this work).

Experimental data in Refs. [43, 74] shows that combining layers can lead to masks comparable in efficiency to medical-grade PPE. The World Health Organisation recommends cloth masks should have at least 3 layers [7], which corresponds to masks that are roughly 2 to 4 mm thick based on the data in Fig. 2(d). Additional layers are treated independently in (11), which is supported by experimental data of Ref. [74] (inset Fig. 7(b)). We show how the effectiveness of a cotton mask with \(\alpha = 0.1\) varies with thickness in Fig. 7(b), finding that multi-layer masks perform considerably better than their single layer counterparts. To illustrate this, we define \(d_{p,0.95}\) as the particle size above which the capture efficiency exceeds 95%. A cotton mask 5 mm thick (roughly the thickness of the store-bought cotton mask we sampled) has a value of \(d_{p,0.95}\) half that of a single 1 mm layer during moderate exertion.

A. Ease of breathing through a mask

The pressure drop across a mask, \(\Delta p\) is given by [42]
\[
\Delta p = \frac{\mu L_z U_0 f_p(\alpha)}{d_f^2}, \quad (12)
\]
where simple estimates for the function \(f_p(\alpha)\) are known from previous studies [42]. The pressure drop across the mask needed for a given flow speed \(U_0\), scales with this speed as well as mask thickness placing limits on how thick masks can be made. It also varies with fibre size as \(d_f^{-2}\), a result that follows directly from Poiseuille flow, so finer fibres are harder to breathe through. This is often expressed in terms of a filter quality factor \(q\) such that \(P = e^{-q \Delta p}\) [50]; substituting \(\Delta p = \bar{\lambda} g_p(\alpha) / \mu U_0\) where \(g_p(\alpha)\) combines the \(\alpha\) dependent terms in \(\xi\) and \(f_p(\alpha)\).

Pressure drops measured across masks vary from a few Pa [44] to 100 Pa and above [72]. This pressure drop cannot be too large, to allow easy breathing. The N95 standard specifies maximum values for \(\Delta p\) of [70] 343 Pa on inhalation and 245 Pa on exhalation (at 851 min\(^{-1}\)). With a fixed limit to \(\Delta p\), there are really only two factors that we can vary: the particle collection efficiency of a single fibre, \(\lambda\), and the mask geometry through \(\alpha\). If \(d_f\) and \(\alpha\) (and thus implicitly \(\lambda\)) are allowed to vary through the mask (from e.g. combining layers of different materials), then the goal is to optimise

\[
\text{maximise } \int_0^{L_z} \frac{\alpha \bar{\lambda}}{(1 - \alpha)(d_f^2)} \, dx \quad \text{subject to } \int_0^{L_z} \frac{1}{d_f^2 f_p(\alpha)} \, dx \leq \frac{\Delta p_{\text{max}}}{\mu U_0}.
\]
resulting from (11) and (12). The resulting efficiency from combining fabric layers has been explored extensively in experiments in Refs. [44] [74].

B. Test of assumption that fibres filter independently

Equation (11) was derived assuming that the fibres filter independently, and each fibre’s local environment is well-described by the same $\alpha$. This can only be approximately true, so we tested it using LB simulations. We calculated the single-fibre $\lambda$ using a system as shown in Fig. 10(a), and also computed the penetration directly using a model filtered composed of five layers of a disordered hexagonal lattice of fibres, using a system as shown in Fig. 10(b).

We compare the predictions of (11) with the actual penetrations in Fig. 6(b). We see that (11) systematically overpredicts the penetration, but that the error is typically relatively small. Thus, as the model is only a very simplified realisation of a mask, we conclude that the approximations involved in (11) give an acceptable level of accuracy. Note that due to the Stokes paradox [57], fibres are never completely independent of each other, and as any mask is disordered the distances between neighbouring fibres will inevitably vary from place to place, so (11) essentially both neglects correlations and assumes each fibre has the same local environment.

C. Mask fit

Face seal leakage from a poorly fitting mask can significantly diminish its filtration ability [44] [68] [78] [83]. We imagine the fit can be expressed as a fit factor $\Gamma_{(in,ex)}$, the fraction of streamlines that flow through the fabric material rather than leak through gaps at its perimeter. In general we expect $\Gamma_{in} > \Gamma_{ex}$ as the mechanical forces involved in inhalation (exhalation) work to improve (reduce) the seal [54]. We incorporate mask fit into the model via

$$P(Q, \Gamma_{(in,ex)}) = (1 - \Gamma_{(in,ex)}) + \Gamma_{(in,ex)} P(\Gamma_{(in,ex)} Q, 0),$$

where $Q$ is the flow rate of breathing (cf. table 1). However, there is very little data available on typical values of $\Gamma_{(in,ex)}$ and the flow physics involved has been highlighted as a research gap during the pandemic [53]. In Ref. [44] it was found that inserting gaps occupying $\sim 1\%$ the area at the perimeter of a fabric sample (which corresponds to an average gap of 0.4 mm at the edges of a circular mask 190 cm$^2$ in area) leads to a reduction in penetration of $\sim 50\%$, however it is unclear how representative these gaps are of typical cloth masks. In the absence of other data, we take $\Gamma_{ex} = 0.5$ and $\Gamma_{in} = 0.75$.

V. EFFECTIVENESS OF MASKS IN REDUCING DISEASE TRANSMISSION RATES

Now that we have a framework for describing the filtration characteristics of masks, we will investigate their total effectiveness by combining these calculations with known distributions of exhaled droplets and their role in disease transmission. One issue with (1) is that the effectiveness on inhalation and exhalation are not independent, because the droplet distribution on inhalation depends on whether an intervention is applied at the source. In subsequent sections we introduce a framework to treat this effect, incorporating empirical size distributions of exhaled droplets.

A. Size distribution of droplets in breath

To assess filtration efficiency we need to know the sizes of the droplets that we need to filter. An arbitrary threshold of diameter $d_\alpha < 5\mu m$ is made for aerosols in the medical literature [10] [85] [86], but Fig. 8(a) shows that much larger droplets can remain in the air sufficiently long enough for inhalation to occur [11] so we will consider the entire size distribution of exhaled droplets.

The droplets start in exhaled breath, and the size distribution of droplets in breath varies with the exhalation mode i.e. breathing, speech or coughing [57]. It also varies with age, physiology and even temporally. For example, in Ref. [86] it was found that the size distribution of the same individual’s sneezes can vary between being unimodal and bimodal. Ref. [86] found that the speech volume increases emissions, and around $\sim 20\%$ of the population were “speech superemitters”: they consistently produce an order of magnitude more droplets during speech than the rest of the population, a phenomenon which may contribute to superspreading events.

Droplets immediately begin to evaporate upon exhalation [53] [50] and larger droplets may fragment during transit [51] [91] [92]. There are significant inconsistencies in reported size distributions of exhaled droplets given the complexity outlined above, the variation in experimental protocols, and the myriad of different ways in which evaporative kinetics are corrected for (or not). To make progress we select the study of Ref. [72] because it treats the modes of breath, speech and coughing within a consistent protocol, accounting for evaporative kinetics between exhalation and detection. Moreover, they provide a convenient parameterisation of exhaled size distributions using a trimodal model motivated by the three known physiological mechanisms of droplet formation: bronchiolar film rupture [75] [94] [95], shear-induced instability in the mucus-air interface [8] [89] and oral cavity mechanisms [72] [75] [94]. Only the first mechanism occurs in ordinary breathing, and the size distribution is unimodal [72] [75] [94]. Their results for speech modes are consistent with e.g. Ref. [80]. Other studies (and their inconsistencies) are collated in Ref. [88].
FIG. 9. (colour online) Effectiveness of cotton masks at reducing transmission rates $\beta$. The masks have $\alpha = 0.1$, a thickness $L_\alpha = 3$ mm, and the flow rates are consistent with moderate exertion. In each of (a–c) we have plotted the fractional transmission as a function of $m$ for three scenarios: with masked exhaler only, masked inhaler only, and both masked — in each case with masks that fit perfectly (dashed curves), and with leakage (solid curves). The $y$ axis is $\beta/\beta_0$, and $\beta/\beta_0$ is also indicated with colour: yellow for $\beta/\beta_0$ close to one, and blue for small $\beta/\beta_0$. Our approximations for leakage are 25% on inhalation and 50% on exhalation. (d–f) Contour plots of $\beta/\beta_0$ — using the same colour scheme as (a–c) — as a function of infectivity moment $m$ ($x$ axis), and mask wearing probability $p_m$ ($y$ axis). In (d–f) we assume the same leakage levels as for the solid curves in (a–c), and all three scenarios of mask wear in the general population are considered. Each column corresponds to an exhalation mode shown in Fig. 8(b), i.e. (a,d) coughs, (b,e) speech and (c,f) breath.

A droplet of diameter $d_{p,ex} = d_p(t = 0)$ on exhalation will have diameter $d_{p,in} = \kappa(t)d_{p,ex}$ on inhalation, where $\kappa < 1$ is the evaporation factor. The filtration efficacy of masks will decrease until $d_{p,in} \sim 0.3\mu m$ [64], so we can obtain a lower bound on their effectiveness by taking the long time limit on $\kappa(t)$ when droplets reach their smallest equilibrium state (the “nuclei”). For respiratory droplets in relative humidities $\lesssim 70\%$ (typical of indoor environments) $\lim_{t \to \infty} \kappa(t) \sim 1/3$ over a range of parameters [90], so we assume the equilibrium size is $\sim 1/3$ that of the wet size on exhalation.

1. Rate of disease transmission

We need a model for how the rate of transmission $\beta$ depends on the number and size of droplets inhaled. As little is known about this, we will construct a simple model. We assume that inhaled droplets of diameter $d_{p,in}$ have a diameter-dependent infectivity $I(d_{p,in})$, which describes the likelihood of causing disease in a susceptible individual. Then if the transmission rate depends linearly on this infectivity, the fractional reduction in transmission is given by

$$\frac{\beta}{\beta_0} = \frac{\int \int P(d_{p,in})(d_{p,ex})d\mu(d_{p,in})}{\int \int P(d_{p,in})d\mu_0(d_{p,in})}$$

(13)

where $P$ is given by (11). Within our approximation the probability measure $\mu(d_{p,in}) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \kappa(t)P(d_{p,ex})\mu_0(d_{p,ex})$, and $\mu_0$ is the distribution on exhalation from Ref. [72]. We set $P(d_{p,in,ex}) = 1$ if no mask is worn by the inhaler and/or exhaler.

The infectivity will depend on, amongst other factors, the concentration of viable virus and the deposition pattern within the respiratory tract. Virus viability depends on the internal droplet dynamics, as well as the droplet’s chemical and surface properties which are in turn affected by the full history of its evaporative kinetics [93], so (13) is already an approximation. Infectivity and the required dose for infection is heavily debated, even for well-studied diseases like influenza [95][100].

Naively we may expect the probability of a new infection to be proportional to the total number of virus numbers arriving at the receiver i.e. $I(d_{p,in}) \propto d_{p,in}^3$. Alternatively, we could imagine that a single virus is enough to cause disease and the limiting factor is e.g. the rate of deposition of respirable particles inside the respiratory tract; in
this case the rate is simply proportional to the total inhaled number of droplets and $I(d_{p,in}) \sim const$. More realistically we expect a situation somewhere between these two extremes, and so we write $I(d_{p,in}) = d_{p,in}^m$ where $m$ is the infectivity moment. We use $m$ as a single parameter to select the particle sizes most relevant to this mode of disease transmission, to obtain qualitative information on how this affects mask effectiveness. We illustrate the effect that the weight $d_{p}^m$ has on the exhaled size distribution in Fig. 5(b), noting that strict volume and number scaling are recovered for $m = 3$ and $m = 0$ respectively.

Our final result is presented in Fig. 9 where we plot the effectiveness of cotton masks in reducing transmission rates as a function of the infectivity moment, for (from left to right) coughing, speaking and breathing. We consider the effect of masking the exhaler only, the inhaler only, and both. In the top row we plot the fractional transmission as a function of $m$, while the plots in the bottom row are contour plots of the fractional transmission as functions of $m$ ($x$ axis) and adherence ($y$ axis).

We find that masks perform better with increasing $m$ for cough and speech modes because this selects droplets in the $100 \mu m$ range which will be filtered out efficiently, see Fig. 7. Note that ordinarily these large droplets would sediment a short distance from the exhailer, so these could possibly be excluded if considering the effectiveness of masks when social distancing is practiced.

For droplets entirely in the $1 \mu m$ range (as indicated by the breath mode), we found that interventions at exhalation and inhalation were comparable in magnitude and neither were strongly affected by $m$. Masking both exhailer and inhaler leads to a $\sim 50\%$ reduction in transmission. We note that $p_m \gtrsim 80\%$ is typical of countries with universal masking, and $p_m \lesssim 20\%$ for European countries without masks [101].

We note that with our leakage parameters (50% on exhalation, 25% on inhalation) masking the inhaler is generally better than the exhailer. Of course masking both is best. If we have over-estimated the difference in leakage between inhalation and exhalation, then decreasing $\Gamma_m - \Gamma_ex$ would lead to masking the exhailer having a stronger benefit than masking the inhaler (consistent with source control being a route to prevent the spread of airbourne disease). Overall, these calculations suggest that the inhaler may be better protected than previously believed, which is broadly consistent with Refs. [44, 74].

VI. DISCUSSION

Masks and face-coverings affect two of the steps in the transmission of a respiratory infection such as COVID-19. These are exhalation from an infected person, and inhalation by a susceptible person. Mask effectiveness is not independent of other aspects of transmission, for example, mask efficiency is highest for droplets so large they sediment rapidly. Presumably masks compete with the reduction purely from sedimentation. Sedimentation plays a crucial role at large physical separations and is the reason to promote physical distancing.

Nevertheless, we can say a number of things about masks:

1. Even with 25 to 50% leakage our model predicts that masks would reduce exposure risk by $\gtrsim 25\%$ across a range of parameters. We believe this to be a lower bound, and while this reduction may seem small it is worth pointing out that a reduction in $R$ from $R_0 = 4$ by this amount would prevent $\sim 75\%$ of cases during one month of exponential growth assuming a case doubling time of 3.5 days [102]. Improving the reliability would require better data on, in particular, typical face seal in cloth masks.

2. Optimising the size of the natural fibres may be difficult because the variety of fibres available in common fabrics is limited. Increasing the thickness of the mask through the number of layers (or otherwise) remains a highly effective way to improve mask effectiveness and is consistent with the World Health Organisation’s latest guidelines [7]. Masking the inhaller offered better-than-expected protection, being better than masking the exhailer across most exhalation modes and infectivity models. This was mostly due to the assumed better fit on inhalation, which may not be realistic. However, this potentially suggests cloth masks offer better protection to the wearer than previously thought. We have not explored how the mask effectiveness would change during repeat use and increased moisture content, or how captured material in contaminated masks could become re-suspended; these are potentially important considerations that could reduce the overall efficacy from our calculations.

3. In Fig. 9 we see that for larger values of the infectivity size moment $m$ masks dramatically reduce transmission for speech and coughing. This is due to filtration of the droplets in the larger mode centred on $d_{p} \sim 100 \mu m$ at exhalation. Moreover, the larger droplets would quickly sediment so they would only be inspired at close contact. We neglected droplet sedimentation and took the incoming droplets to be all exhaled droplets, just reduced in size by evaporation to their smallest size. Ideally we would identify the size of droplets for a given level of exposure (say distance from exhailer), and account for sedimentation of droplets as was done in Refs. [93, 90]. This could provide detailed information of the effectiveness of masks for different levels of exposure and inform social distancing policies.

4. We introduced a simple model of the infectivity to explore qualitatively how different models of disease transmission would affect the mask effectiveness, however our model was very crude so more realistic descriptions of infectivity would greatly im-
prove this model. Ideas from the model in Ref. [28] could be incorporated but this would require more understanding of SARS-CoV-19 such as its minimal infective dose and accurate measurements of viable virus concentrations vs droplet size.

A. The rapid increase in filtration efficiency for particle diameters in the range 1 to 10 µm is associated with a dynamical phase transition

The rapid rise in filtration efficiency for particle diameters in the micrometre range, see Fig. 4, is associated with an (avoided for \( d_p/d_f > 0 \)) dynamical phase transition. In the \( d_p/d_f = 0 \) limit at small values of \( \text{St} \), varying \( \text{St} \) has no effect on the filtration efficiency, which is zero. Then above the dynamical phase transition, it increases, see Fig. 5. This transition was first studied by Araújo et al. [22], but the implications of this transition for filtration have not been studied, so far as we are aware. This is despite the avoided transition occurring in a size range where there are many droplets, particularly for a person speaking. Understanding this transition better, and studying it for more realistic models, may help to us to design filters that exploit inertia to filter better.

B. Aspects of mask use we have not studied, but which are important

We expect masks at the source to disrupt the jet of air, e.g. from a cough, restricting how far it travels. This effect of a mask should reduce transmission, but we have not studied it here.

Other important topics we have not addressed include the re-use and washing of masks [103], how their effectiveness changes over time and and the possibility of constructing cloth masks with electrostatic interactions. There is a need for proper washing of masks without damaging the fibre network as SARS-CoV-2 has been reported to have a surface stability of several days [18] and continuous use could lead to re-suspension of viral material. Incorporating electret layers into cloth masks by repurposing commonly available equipment is an interesting idea being explored [104], which could open the path to creating cloth masks with comparable efficacy to medical-grade respirators. We generally expect mechanical efficiencies to improve with time as collection of material leads to an increase in \( \alpha \) (and the effective \( d_f \)), so aging is unimportant in this work. However, the charging in electrets can have a lifetime of \( \sim 6 \) weeks [69], so aging of mask effectiveness would become an issue. Finally, we note that by focusing on inhalation, we have neglected by necessity the possibility of e.g. transmission through the eyes [31, 36].

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The basic physics of filtration by fibrous filters, means that filtering out particles of diameter close to 5 µm and above, is straightforwardly achieved by standard fabrics. For fibres of typical diameters of order 5 µm, the Stokes number is of order one or more, and so droplets of this size cannot follow the air streamlines faithfully. They then deviate from the path of the air flowing through the mask, and so collide with the fibres and are filtered out. However, filtering out sub-micrometre droplets is much harder as these faithfully track the streamlines of air flowing through the mask. Without introducing electrostatic interactions, which feature in common fabrics only to a very limited extent it is hard to see how to reliably filter out droplets in this size range.

Our estimates here relied on the standard models of the physics of filtration by fibrous filters. These capture the essential physics, but rely on simple, two-dimensional, models. We have generalised these models to incorporate the polydisperse fibre diameter distributions obtained from experiments, with SEM. Our analysis suggests that the distribution of smaller fibres which combine into larger thread, rather than the threads themselves or the complex patterns used to form textiles, are sufficient to capture the main features of mask efficacy. There is scope for future work to look at three-dimensional models, models where droplets do not couple to the flow field just at the centre of mass, and models for the fibre/droplet interaction.

Even masks made from simple cotton fabrics are predicted to reduce transmission of respiratory viruses, unless transmission is dominated by sub-micrometre droplets. As masks are cheap, and wearing a mask is a minor inconvenience, recommending mask use is a simple way to reduce transmission. A simple face covering will never completely eliminate transmission, as some virus-laden droplets will always bypass it. However, unless transmission is dominated by sub-micrometre droplets, mask use should reduce the number of people infected by an infected person, \( R \), and so contribute to preventing spread.

The effectiveness of masks in reducing transmission cannot be determined independently of the other steps in transmission. As we can see in Fig. 9, mask effectiveness depends on how infectivity varies with the size of droplets, which may well vary with conditions, such as proximity of people, indoors vs. outdoors, etc. We need either direct data on transmission rates as a function of conditions, with and without masks, or a much better idea of how infectivity varies with droplet size. Both of these will be challenging but both are possible.
Appendix A: Explicit Kuwabara flow field parameters

The components of velocity in plane polar coordinates are

\[ u_r = u \cdot e_r = \cos \theta \frac{f(\rho)}{\rho}, \quad (A1a) \]
\[ u_\theta = u \cdot e_\theta = -\sin \theta \frac{f(\rho)}{\rho}, \quad (A1b) \]

The vorticity is

\[ \omega = \nabla \times u \quad (A2) \]

The outer boundary conditions introduced in section [II A 1] can be expressed as

\[ f(\rho_b) = \rho_b, \quad (A3a) \]
\[ f(\rho_0) - \rho_0 f'(\rho_0) - \rho_b^2 f''(\rho_b) = 0, \quad (A3b) \]

where \( \rho_b = a_f / \sqrt{\alpha} \) is the location of the outer boundary. Together with the inner boundary conditions \( f(a_f) = 0 \) (no penetration) and \( f'(a_f) = 0 \) (no slip) we obtain the solution for the coefficients in [4b] as

\[ f_1 = \frac{2 - \alpha - a_f^2}{4K}, \quad (A4a) \]
\[ f_2 = \frac{\alpha - 1}{2K}, \quad (A4b) \]
\[ f_3 = -\frac{\alpha}{4a_f^2 K}, \quad (A4c) \]
\[ f_4 = \frac{1}{K}, \quad (A4d) \]

introducing the hydrodynamic factor:

\[ K = -\ln \alpha - \frac{3}{4} + \alpha - \frac{\alpha^2}{4}. \quad (A4e) \]

This flow field was first obtained by Kuwabara [58], from whom it bears its name.

Appendix B: Lattice Boltzmann simulations of flow field around fibres

Lattice Boltzmann (LB) simulations are performed on a two-dimensional lattice of \( n_x \) by \( n_y \) lattice sites; \( x \) is the flow direction. Our code is a modified version of a Python code of the Palabos group at the University of Geneva [63]. Their code models flow around a cylinder.

The lattice is the standard square D2Q9 lattice with nine velocities at each lattice site [60, 62], each pointing along a vector \( e_i \). The vectors \( e_i = (0, 0), (0, -1), (0, 1), (-1, 0), (-1, -1), (-1, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1), (1, -1) \). The LB fluid has only one parameter, its relaxation rate \( \tau \). This controls the LB dynamics via

\[ f_i(r+e_i,t+1) = f_i(r,t) - \tau^{-1} [f_i(r,t) - f_{eq,i}(r,t)] \quad (B1) \]

for \( f_i(r,t) \) the density at site \( r \) and time \( t \), associated with flow in direction \( i \). The density \( \rho_{LB} = \sum_i f_i \), and the flow velocity \( u = \rho_{LB}^{-1} \sum_i f_i e_i \). The LB gas is compressible, so the density \( \rho_{LB} \) does vary with position but at the small Reynolds numbers we run for, this variation is small. We start with an initial density \( \rho_{LB} = 1 \). The equilibrium density is

\[ f_{eq,i}(r,t) = \rho_{LB} w_i [1 + 3e_i, u] \quad (B2) \]

with weights \( w_i = (4/9, 1/9, 1/9, 1/9, 1/9, 1/36, 1/36, 1/9, 1/36, 1/36) \).

The LB’s relaxation time \( \tau \) sets the LB kinematic viscosity, via \( \nu_{LB} = (2\tau - 1)/6 \) [61]. We set \( \tau = 1 \) in LB units. This sets its kinematic viscosity to be \( \nu_{LB} = 1/6 \) in LB units. The LB method suffers from stability issues outside of a relatively narrow range of values of \( \tau \leq 1 \) [62]. We compared \( \lambda \) values for \( \tau = 0.75 \) and \( \tau = 1 \), and there were only very small differences.

We run the LB simulations until the change in mean flow speed along \( x \) is very small. We then take that flow field as being a steady-state flow field, and use it to evaluate particle trajectories.

1. Boundary conditions

We have periodic boundary conditions along the direction perpendicular to flow \( (y) \). Along the downstream edge along \( x \), we impose continuity of the missing components. The three missing components are the ones pointing upstream (because in the bulk these are propagated from the line of elements downstream which are missing along this edge). We simply set the values along the final row equal to their known values along the last-but-one row. As this downstream of the fibres, we expect this boundary to have little effect on our results.

a. Zou-He boundary conditions

To impose the flow field, we use standard Zou-He boundary conditions [60] along the upstream, \( x = 0 \) edge of the simulation box. To do this, we first impose velocity along left-edge lattice sites, at \( u_x = u_{BC} \) and \( u_y = 0 \), then within Zou He boundary conditions, the density is calculated from

\[ \rho = \frac{1}{1 - u} [f_0 + f_1 + f_2 + 2(f_3 + f_4 + f_5)] \quad (B3) \]

note the first three \( f_i \)'s are those corresponding to a zero \( x \) component \( e_i \), while the second three are the ones with negative \( x \) components. We then set the three \( f_i \) with
positive $x$ components

\[ f_6 = f_3 + \frac{2}{3} \rho u_{BC} \]

\[ f_7 = f_5 + \frac{1}{2} (f_3 - f_1) \]  

\[ f_8 = f_4 - \frac{1}{2} (f_3 - f_1) \]

\[ (\text{B4}) \]

\[ (\text{B5}) \]

\[ (\text{B6}) \]

2. Fibres

A fibre is modelled as a circular domain of all lattice sites within a radius $r_{LB}$ of the fibre centre. So the simulation lattice has two types of sites, air sites plus fibre sites. The boundary conditions on the fibres are standard LB on-site bounce back \[ [61, 105] \], to model stick boundary conditions. So at every step the velocities in all fibre sites are reversed.

The fibre radius is the lengthscale we use to define the Reynolds number in our simulation, via $\text{Re} = \frac{u_{BC} r_{LB}}{\nu_{LB}} < 1$.

2. Model mask

We model the fibres as a disordered hexagonal lattice of discs, each of the same radius $r_{LB}$, see Fig. 10(b). The lattice constant of the hexagonal lattice is $a$, and so the fibres occupy an area fraction, $\alpha = \frac{\pi \sqrt{3}/2}{(2r/a)^2}$. The disordered lattice is obtained by starting with a perfectly ordered hexagonal lattice, then displacing the centre of a disc randomly and uniformly within a square of side $r_{\text{disp}}$ centred at the position in the perfect lattice.

Note that in a perfect lattice some streamlines periodically repeat along with the lattice and simulations of particles with low Stokes number are then also periodic and so are not filtered out, no matter how many layers there are in the lattice. As the fibres in masks are not perfectly ordered, this is unrealistic, and so we introduce the disorder.

3. A fibre for calculation of $\lambda$

We cannot have an isolated single fibre in two dimensions due to the Stokes paradox. So, we simulate in effect a single row of fibres perpendicular to the flow direction, with a spacing of the lattice constant $a$. This is shown in Fig. 10(a). The system has two fibres, one in the centre (along $y$) for the calculation of $\lambda$ and another at the edge. Thus it should be borne in mind that our “single-fibre” is a fibre in an array of a set density, and that this density affects the flow field.

4. Particle trajectories

Once we have a steady-state flow-field, we simulate (independent) particle trajectories in this flow field, to estimate the $\lambda$ or filtration efficiency.

Each particle’s trajectory is obtained by starting the particle at a point at $x = 0$, and at a selected $y$ coordinate. The particle’s initial velocity is that of the flow field. The only force on the particle is Stokes drag from the flow field. Therefore its acceleration obeys \[ \frac{d^2 \mathbf{r}}{dt^2} = -6 \pi \eta \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}) \]

We then integrate the trajectory forward in time, using modified Euler integration, until the particle either collides with a fibre, or reaches the right-hand (large $x$) edge of the simulation box. At each time step, we check for a collision. A collision occurs if the centre of the particle is within the radii of the fibre and particle.

a. Evaluation of $\lambda$ from Lattice Boltzmann flow field

The single-fibre $\lambda$ is determined by starting with a pair of initial positions along $y$ that bracket the value of $y$ that separates where particle trajectories collide with the fibre and where the particle passes by the fibre. One initial position is the $y$ coordinate of the centre of the fibre and the
second is sufficiently far away that trajectory misses the fibre. Then a bisection search is performed to accurately determine where the dividing \( y \) is for collisions. \( \lambda \) is then just twice this \( y \) value; the collision zone is symmetric around the centre of the central fibre as the simulation box is symmetric, see Fig. 10(a).

### b. Evaluation of penetration of model filter from Lattice Boltzmann flow field

The penetration for a model mask is determined by starting a set of \( N_{\text{samp}} \) particles on an evenly-spaced grid along the \( y \) axis. Then particle trajectories are calculated, and the penetration is estimated from the fraction of particles that penetrate the model filter.

### Appendix C: Scanning electron microscope images

Unless otherwise stated, SEM images feature a 100 \( \mu \)m scalebar. Macroscopically, the inner layer of both N95/FFP2 respirators and one of the KN95 respirators appeared to consist of a single layer; however, under SEM imaging we found two distinct populations of fibre sizes on opposing sides of the sample which we treat as two fused layers. We number these layers 1 and 2 for the innermost and outermost inner layers respectively. The distribution of fibre sizes determined from these images (and additional images not shown) are shown in Fig. 11. The parameters of the log-normal fits to these size distributions, as well as the measured material properties (thickness and volume fraction) are given in table II.
Surgical masks (labelled SM1 and SM2):

3-layered cotton mask:

Knitted fabrics:

Woven fabrics:
Appendix D: Diffusion collection efficiency

To model the effect of diffusion we use the result of Stechkina and Fuchs [106]:

$$\frac{\lambda D}{d_f} = \frac{2.9}{(KPe^2)^{1/3}} + \frac{0.624}{Pe} + \frac{1.24R^{2/3}}{\sqrt{KPe}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (D1)

where $R = d_p/d_f$, and $K$ is given by (4b) — this expression assumes the Kuwabara flow field. Note that the Péclet number scales as $Pe \propto d_f$ (see definition in the main text) which must be taken into consideration when averaging over a polydisperse system of fibres.

Appendix E: Electrostatic potential around cylindrical fibres

The electric potential of a line charge (monopole) of magnitude $\Lambda$ centred at the origin is

$$\Phi_0 = -\frac{\Lambda}{2\pi\epsilon_0} \ln \left( \frac{\rho}{\rho_0} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (E1)

where $\rho_0$ is a reference point close to the line charge where we set the potential is zero, and $\epsilon_0$ is the vacuum permittivity. This generalises to assemblies of line charges on the fibre surface $\rho = a_f$ via a multipole expansion of $\ln(\rho/\rho_0)$ [107]. For surface line charge distributions of the form $\sigma = \sigma_0 \cos(k\theta)$ we find the electric potential outside the fibre adopts the form

$$\Phi_k = \frac{\sigma_0 a_f^{k+1} \cos(k\theta)}{\epsilon_0(1 + \epsilon_f)\rho}$$  \hspace{1cm} (E2)

for $k > 0$ and $\rho > a_f$ and where $\epsilon_f$ is the dielectric constant of the fibre. For electret fibres the most important terms from this expansion are the monopole term (E1) for fibres with no charge, or the $k = 1$ term

$$\Phi_1 = \frac{\sigma_0 a_f^2 \cos \theta}{\epsilon_0(1 + \epsilon_f)\rho}$$  \hspace{1cm} (E2)

for fibres with a dipole polarisation.

Dielectric breakdown is expected to occur where the field $|\Phi'(a_f)| = 3 \times 10^6$ V m$^{-1}$, the dielectric strength of air. This corresponds to surface charges of $\sigma_0 \sim 3$ nC cm$^{-2}$ for monopole fibres and $\sigma_0 \sim (1 + \epsilon_f)3$ nC cm$^{-2}$ for dipolar fibres. Polypropylene, a widely used material for the electret fibres in respirators, has $\epsilon_f \approx 2$ giving $\sigma_0 \sim 9$ nC cm$^{-2}$. Electret fibres can readily sustain charges in the $O(1 \text{nC cm}^{-2})$ range [50, 69], so they are close to this upper limit.

Natural cellulose fabrics such as cotton and wool can typically sustain a maximum charge density in the range of $O(0.01 \text{nC cm}^{-2})$ (or $O(0.1 \text{nC cm}^{-2})$ for silk) when charged triboelectrically [108]. This is one to two orders of magnitude smaller than in electret fibres, so we expect electromagnetic forces to be negligible in cloth fabrics compared to respirators.
Fabric | Type | Material | Bulk Density | $\mu_{df}$ | $\sigma_{df}$ | $L$ (mm) | $\alpha$ |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
N95/FFP2 respirator 1 inner layers | respirator | polypropylene | 0.91 | - | - | 0.448 | 0.087 |
N95/FFP2 respirator 1 inner layer 1 | - | - | - | 0.375 | 0.189 | - | - |
N95/FFP2 respirator 1 inner layer 2 | - | - | - | 2.987 | 0.074 | - | - |
N95/FFP2 respirator 1 middle layer | respirator | polypropylene | 0.91 | 2.807 | 0.145 | 0.663 | 0.114 |
N95/FFP2 respirator 1 outer layer | respirator | polypropylene | 3.238 | 0.104 | 0.944 | 0.101 |
N95/FFP2 respirator 2 inner layers | respirator | polypropylene | 0.91 | - | - | 0.595 | 0.069 |
N95/FFP2 respirator 2 inner layer 1 | - | - | - | 1.733 | 0.378 | - | - |
N95/FFP2 respirator 2 inner layer 2 | - | - | - | 3.023 | 0.066 | - | - |
N95/FFP2 respirator 2 outer layer | respirator | polypropylene | 0.91 | 3.216 | 0.048 | 0.996 | 0.131 |
N95 respirator 1 inner layer | respirator | polypropylene | 0.91 | - | - | 0.883 | 0.088 |
N95 respirator 1 middle layer | respirator | polypropylene | 2.807 | 0.145 | 0.663 | 0.114 |
N95 respirator 1 outer layer | respirator | polypropylene | 3.238 | 0.104 | 0.944 | 0.101 |
N95 respirator 2 inner layers | respirator | polypropylene | 0.91 | - | - | 0.595 | 0.069 |
N95 respirator 2 inner layer 1 | - | - | - | 0.733 | 0.378 | - | - |
N95 respirator 2 inner layer 2 | - | - | - | 3.023 | 0.066 | - | - |
N95 respirator 2 middle layer | respirator | polypropylene | 0.91 | 2.828 | 0.211 | 1.902 | 0.026 |
N95 respirator 2 outer layer | respirator | polypropylene | 3.268 | 0.048 | 0.996 | 0.131 |
Surgical mask 1 both layers | surgical mask | polypropylene | 0.91 | - | - | 0.883 | 0.088 |
Surgical mask 1 inner layer | - | - | - | 0.971 | 0.456 | - | - |
Surgical mask 1 outer layer | - | - | - | 3.114 | 0.072 | - | - |
Surgical mask 2 both layers | surgical mask | polypropylene | 0.91 | - | - | 0.931 | 0.076 |
Surgical mask 2 inner layer | - | - | - | 0.771 | 0.385 | - | - |
Surgical mask 2 outer layer | - | - | - | 3.026 | 0.091 | - | - |
Cloth mask inner layer | woven | linen | 1.50 | 0.269 | 0.356 | 1.200 | 0.079 |
Cloth mask medium layer | woven | cotton | 1.54 | 2.714 | 0.248 | 2.300 | 0.149 |
Cloth mask outer layer | woven | cotton | 1.54 | 2.775 | 0.282 | 1.027 | 0.077 |
Shirt | knitted | silk | 1.33 | 2.780 | 0.079 | 0.804 | 0.088 |
t-shirt 1 | knitted | cotton | 1.54 | 2.703 | 0.358 | 0.960 | 0.120 |
t-shirt 2 | knitted | 60% cotton 40% polyester | 1.476 | 2.759 | 0.287 | 0.814 | 0.138 |
cleaning cloth | knitted | cotton | 1.54 | 2.549 | 0.396 | 2.673 | 0.072 |
tie 1 | woven | polyester | 1.38 | 2.682 | 0.269 | 0.825 | 0.138 |
tie 2 | woven | silk | 1.33 | 2.578 | 0.152 | 0.540 | 0.263 |
tea towel | woven | cotton | 1.58 | 2.594 | 0.354 | 2.017 | 0.073 |
vacuum cleaner bag | non-woven | cellulose | 1.50 | 3.427 | 0.484 | 0.349 | 0.117 |
vacuum cleaner filter | non-woven | cellulose | 1.50 | 3.379 | 0.332 | 0.907 | 0.014 |
paper towel | non-woven | cellulose | 1.50 | 3.031 | 0.400 | 0.402 | 0.074 |
felt | non-woven | felt | 1.50 | 2.664 | 0.113 | 2.29 | 0.057 |
coffee filter | non-woven | cellulose | 1.50 | 3.253 | 0.263 | 0.379 | 0.088 |
all purpose kitchen cloth | non-woven | 70% viscose 30% PET | 1.534 | 2.490 | 0.128 | 0.618 | 0.049 |

Table II. Measured properties of sample masks. The manufacturer did not state what material the surgical masks and respirators were made of, so we assigned polypropylene to them as our best guess. For the 60% cotton t-shirt we state the results for the first (most likely cotton) peak. Parameters are shown for the distribution of fibre diameters modelled by the log-normal $\ln (d_{f}/\mu_{m}) \sim N(\mu_{df}, \sigma_{df}^2)$; the modal diameter is thus given by $\exp (\mu_{df}) \mu_{m}$.
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Natural cellulose fabrics such as cotton and wool can be treated with a surface charge to make electret masks, which can sustain a charge density of about 1 to 3 nC cm\(^{-2}\) for cylinders with a surface charge density in the range of 3 to 10 nC cm\(^{-2}\). This charge can sustain almost the maximum charge density for silk, which is about 0.1 nC cm\(^{-2}\) (depending on the fibre’s dielectric constant), when charged to a high electric field. Fiber charge buildup is a result of the dielectric constant of the fibre material. For example, cotton and wool have high dielectric constants, so they can sustain more charge. Synthetic polymers such as polyester or polypropylene typically sustain a maximum charge density in the range of 0.01 nC cm\(^{-2}\), which is much lower than that of natural fibres.

In the literature, the terms droplet and aerosol are used to describe distinct routes for disease transmission, mediated by liquid droplets in different size regimes and solid particles or dust, respectively. Different fibres can adsorb different chemicals, and in situ measurements of the adsorption properties of fibres can provide important insights into the performance of fibres in the filtration of droplets or particles. For example, in situ electrostatic deposition of particles on a fibre can be used to determine the filtration efficiency of a fibre, and in situ measurements of the adsorption properties of fibres can provide important insights into the performance of fibres in the filtration of droplets or particles.

Electrostatics could become important for other fibres made from synthetic polymers such as polyester or polypropylene, and we expect this to have minimal impact on filter efficiency. Electrostatics could become important for other fibres made from synthetic polymers such as polyester or polypropylene, and we expect this to have minimal impact on filter efficiency. Electrostatics could become important for other fibres made from synthetic polymers such as polyester or polypropylene, and we expect this to have minimal impact on filter efficiency. The dielectric constant of the fibre material is also important, and natural cellulose fabrics such as cotton and wool have high dielectric constants, so they can sustain more charge. Synthetic polymers such as polyester or polypropylene typically sustain a maximum charge density in the range of 0.01 nC cm\(^{-2}\), which is much lower than that of natural fibres.
FIG. 11. Distribution of fibre diameters in sampled fabric layers determined from analysis of SEM images (points) and their log-normal fits (lines). Mask layers are grouped by those with similar size distributions. (a-d) Sampled masks show progressively smaller fibres as they move innerwards; this is true for all surgical masks (SM), respirators (Resp) and the (cotton/linen) cloth mask sampled. Panel (a) shows that the innermost layer was particularly fine in all cases, containing fibres an order of magnitude smaller in the O(1 µm) range. (e) Other fabric samples showed fibres of comparable diameter (10 to 20 µm) and polydispersity to those in sampled masks (and cotton samples shown in Fig. 2 in the main text), suggesting they could be used as substitute materials in homemade masks. (f) Paper samples contained the largest and most polydisperse fibres, suggesting they would have worse filtration performance than the cloth layers sampled.